

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
2006 Issue Scan Work Group	2	<p>Help people understand which public agencies have what roles in forest management: This topic is well covered in the background information for Strategy A in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i>. The Board has approved a <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> Communications Plan through Objective 1 of its <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> implementation work plan. Implementation of the Communications Plan will incorporate this concept.</p>
Adam Novick	1	<p>Develop a strategy of protecting the conservation market for oak savanna: Oak savanna conservation is an important concern and is capturing the attention of a growing number of organizations and landowners. The Board has directed the ODF staff to investigate the issue further and return with options for addressing it, initially through the Board's Forest Regulation work plan. We invite your continued input as the process continues.</p>
Amy Amoroso	2	<p>Improved coordination with federal land management agencies: The Governor has directed the Board to play a lead role on this topic for the State of Oregon. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, and the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan, will address this issue.</p>
Arlene Whalen	2	<p>Utilize forest biomass; increase engagement with Invasive Species Council: The Board's Forest Vitality work plan calls for promoting incentives, including market-based solutions, to address biomass, forest health, and fire issues. This work will include coordinating with other entities – including the federal government – and assessing the state of current knowledge about the effects of large-scale biomass removal on sensitive forest resources.</p> <p>The Forest Vitality work plan, along with Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, also provides for Board and ODF involvement in federal forest management planning, including addressing biomass issues.</p> <p>Your letter also mentioned invasive species. This is a serious and growing problem in our forests. Based on input received during the issue scan, the Board has requested additional ODF staff work on the issue, including suggesting possible roles for the Board. We expect to begin creating a new Board work plan on this topic during 2006.</p>
Bhagwati Poddar	2	<p>Harvest buffers for small streams: The Board is currently deliberating tree retention requirements on small fish-bearing streams through its Forest Regulation work plan. In particular, Objectives 1 through 3 address this issue, and concepts for new administrative rules are being developed.</p>

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Bhagwati Poddar	3	<p>Clearcutting: It is understandable that clearcutting elicits strong reactions among some Oregonians. However, a key premise of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> is that different types of forestland should be managed with different emphases. Some lands are managed with a focus on timber production, subject to environmental protections. Other lands are managed to emphasize non-timber values, and still others are managed to produce a broad range of benefits.</p> <p>This mosaic of management approaches is essential to our vision of forests that, over time and across the landscape, produce a sustainable flow of environmental, social, and economic benefits.</p> <p>On lands managed with an emphasis on timber production, our commitment – and our duty under the law – is to ensure that all timber harvesting and management practices are conducted in an environmentally sound manner. A variety of monitoring programs, and ongoing scientific research, help to guide us in this endeavor.</p>
Bruno Meyer	2	<p>Adopt rules based on verifiable science, with a reasonable cost to benefit ratio: This approach is a current Board strategy under the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i>. The Board held a workshop on this issue last September, and continues to address the matter through Objective 2 of its Forest Regulation work plan. In particular, our work on Oregon Administrative Rules 527.714 and 527.765 focuses on this concept.</p>
Carolyn Eady	3	<p>Explore compensation for Board members: You raise an issue that extends beyond the Board of Forestry. Recruiting qualified volunteers for boards and commissions across state government is a matter of frequent public discussion. Although I appreciate your sentiments and your acknowledgment of the growing complexity of our jobs, I feel that this is a topic that would need to be addressed in a broader forum than our board can provide. Any changes to current laws on compensation, and to the current emphasis on volunteer rather than paid members of boards and commissions, would ultimately involve legislative action, after debate among interest groups, the Governor, and others.</p>
Chris Jarmer	1	<p>Address invasive species management: This is a serious and growing problem in our forests. The Board has requested additional ODF staff work on the issue, including suggesting possible roles for the Board. We expect to begin creating a new Board work plan on this topic during 2006.</p>

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Chris Jarmer	2	<p>Expand the investigation of management measures on state lands: This issue will be addressed in Objective 1 of the State Forests Management work plan.</p> <p>The most important aspect of our forest management plans is the emphasis on Adaptive Resource Management (ARM). As we practice ARM, we are continually reviewing new science, exploring the latest technology and modeling efforts, working with consultants to review our operations and techniques, and brainstorming ways to achieve greatest permanent value and the economic, environmental, and social values that comprise the forest management plan. We considered this suggestion to be included as part of the existing work plan that will be carried into 2006.</p>
Committee for Family Forestlands	1	<p>Address invasive species management with broad, coordinated approach: This is a serious and growing problem in our forests. The Board has requested additional ODF staff work on the issue, including suggesting possible roles for the Board. We expect to begin creating a new Board work plan on this topic during 2006.</p>
Committee for Family Forestlands	2	<p>Improve marketing systems and support for family forest landowners: You raise some excellent points. As you suggest, the Board will be addressing these issues through Objective 1 of the Forest Vitality work plan during 2006. The Board will continue to seek your input as we develop our forest sector economic development policies.</p>
Committee for Family Forestlands	2	<p>Encourage diversity in the forest economic sector as a means of maintaining diverse landscapes and supporting family forest landowners: The forest sector economic development policies to be developed through Objective 1 of the Forest Vitality work plan will address this issue. This will be accomplished through the creation of an Institutional Capacity Work Group and Forest Industries Task Force, through consultation with family forestland owners, and with continuing input and contributions from the Committee for Family Forestlands.</p>
Committee for Family Forestlands	2	<p>Stronger focus on forest health problems, disinvestment, and other Eastern Oregon issues: The need to address eastside issues was a common theme in the input we received, and stood out as a matter of concern to the work group and the Board. Various elements throughout the Forest Vitality work plan will address these concerns. The forest sector economic development policies and other measures mentioned above are examples. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the work plan, and the work of the Forest Biomass work group under Objective 4 will also address the concerns the committee has highlighted.</p>

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Committee for Family Forestlands	2	<p>Increase assistance, support for owners with fewer than approximately 20 acres: The Board will be addressing this concern through Objective 1 of the Forest Vitality work plan. Our Urban Outreach work plan also may produce some options for serving landowners with relatively small holdings. We look forward to continued work by the Committee for Family Forestlands in providing the forum for developing recommendations for Board action on this topic.</p>
Craig Chisholm	4	<p>Improve city tree ordinances & Metro's approach: Although ODF helps communities develop tree ordinances, with an emphasis on sustainable forest management, the specifics of those ordinances are within the purview of local jurisdictions rather than the Board or ODF.</p> <p>However, I would add that the Board is very much interested in urban forestry and in helping urban residents understand the value of the forests around them. The Board has developed an Urban Outreach work plan, and we would welcome your input into our efforts in this regard. You will find the plan at the web address referenced below.</p>
Cynthia Orlando	2	<p>Address climate change and implications: This is certainly a concern that the Board, the scientific community, and many others must monitor over time. Although the issue is not directly addressed in our Dynamic Ecosystems work plan, Objective 2 of the plan will bring together existing analytical tools, monitoring data, and research information to begin measuring short-term and long-term ecosystem risks from future forest management and policy choices. Objective 4 of the plan will potentially modify policies and programs to accurately integrate scientific understanding of ecosystem dynamics.</p>
David Eisler	3	<p>Readdress the herbicide issue in light of new sub-lethal effects findings on aquatic species: ODF is highly committed to the restoration and maintenance of healthy watersheds, as demonstrated through a wide variety of monitoring, education, incentive, and regulatory activities. The Oregon Forest Practices Act, which provides for timber harvest that is consistent with the sound management of water, fish, soil, and other resources, regulates the application of pesticide on forestland. ODF shares with the state Department of Agriculture responsibility for enforcing the label requirements and restrictions on pesticide use. These, in turn, are developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.</p> <p>Throughout its history of more than 30 years, the Forest Practices Act has evolved, in part in response to changing scientific understanding. Although the Board is not currently considering any Forest Practices Act rule changes related to pesticide application, I expect the Act to continue to change over time.</p> <p>Your message also mentioned a desire for increased communication and planning relationships with the ODF District Forester. I have forwarded the message to Rick Rogers, our West Oregon District Forester. He can be reached at (541) 935-2283.</p>

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
David Ivanoff	2	<p>Pursue active management on federal land: As you know, the Governor has directed the board to take a lead role in this area on behalf of Oregonians. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, and the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan, will address the issue you raise, and other concerns regarding federal lands.</p>
David Ivanoff	3	<p>Produce sustainable state forest timber harvest volume at the levels predicted in 2001: Consideration of this issue is included in Objective 1 of the Board's State Forests Management work plan. A fuller response to your input is posted at http://oregon.gov/ODF/STATE_FORESTS/docs/2006issuescanresponse.pdf</p> <p>As we proceed with our work plan, we'll be following the principles of adaptive management to use the latest technology and modeling protocols (i.e. the results of the H&H Model Project) as a key data point to discuss the economic, environmental, and social values of management of state forestlands, rather than the numbers generated by the comparative model of several years ago.</p> <p>As has been the case in the past, the Board remains ultimately responsible for any decisions to modify state forest management plans or policies, with the State Forester setting specific harvest levels.</p>
David Morman	1	<p>Revisit third-party forest certification: The Board recognizes this is as an important issue, and will develop a work plan to address its various facets. Currently, ODF has engaged in several studies on certification, including one examining the relationship of various certification systems to the requirements of Oregon's Forest Practices Act. Results of these studies will help form the basis of our work plan. Because of this, combined with other workload items, I expect that the Board's work in this area will begin in earnest in 2007.</p>
David Morman	1	<p>Adopt a policy on future improvement to the Land Use Planning Program & BM 37 administration: Oregon's land use planning program has played a vital role in maintaining the state's forestland base. These issues regarding land use planning have links to the Board's Forest Regulation and Forest Vitality work plans.</p>

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
David Morman	2	Work towards federal alignment with the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i>: Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan, and the work of the Forest Biomass work group under Objective 4 of the work plan will address this issue.
Donald DeVisser	1	Recognize the preference of certified wood in green building standards as a market threat for wood from Oregon's forests; pursue certification: The Board recognizes this is as an important issue, and will develop a work plan to address its various facets. Currently, ODF has engaged in several studies on certification, including one examining the relationship of various certification systems to the requirements of Oregon's Forest Practices Act. Results of these studies will help form the basis of our work plan. Because of this, combined with other workload items, I expect that the Board's work in this area will begin in earnest in 2007.
Donald Ellsworth	2	Manage forests in a sustainable manner that ensures future production and minimizes wildfire: We plan to address this issue through our Forest Vitality work plan. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the work plan, and the work of the Forest Biomass work group under Objective 4, will also address this issue.
Donald Franzen	3	Reevaluate riparian management areas: We are committed to reasonable, scientifically supported, incentive-based approaches to protecting riparian areas and other resources during harvest. In reviewing your letter, the ODF staff concluded that the best step would be to have one of our foresters contact you to determine if assistance or advice can be provided. We have forwarded your message to our local district office. Dan Postrel, the ODF Agency Affairs Director, at (503) 945-7420, can also help put you in touch with the appropriate person.
Donald Grissom	2	Attain quick response to wildfire: The National Fire Plan (NFP) portion of the Wildfire Risk Management Work Plan lays out an ongoing and flexible program to implement the NFP in Oregon and to maximize collaboration and community fire planning efforts. In addition, it helps facilitate the planning and conduct of fuel reduction efforts and biomass utilization projects, as opportunities and federal funding allow. Reports to the Board are scheduled for April and June of 2006 and January and June of 2007.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Eric Geyer	2	Review, recognize and address Oregon's role in global forestry: This issue is among the themes of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> (FPFO) Communications Plan that the Board has approved. This plan is part of a larger work plan to implement the FPFO, the Board's guiding policy document. The issue is also addressed in Objective 1 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan. Additional information on this important subject is available in a report titled <i>Importance of Oregon's Forests in US and International Markets</i> . Copies are available from the ODF Forest Resources Planning Program (503-945-7411).
Gary Springer	2	Gauge public support for involvement in federal forest management issues: Your point here is very well taken. As you know, Governor Kulongoski has directed the Board to play a more prominent role in federal land issues. We acknowledge the conflict that has long surrounded these issues, and are committed to a broad-based effort to develop a position on behalf of Oregonians. In the course of this process, we will seek out many views. Some of this information may come from past and ongoing polling by OFRI and others; more input will come through discussions and work sessions with groups and individuals.
Gary Springer	2	Develop a new definition of "forest resources protection:" Objectives 1 and 2 of the Board's Dynamic Ecosystems work plan will result in a public symposium on dynamic ecosystems and synthesize existing analytical tools, monitoring data, and research information to begin quantifying short-term and long-term ecosystem risks from future forest management and policy choices. Objective 4 will potentially modify policies and programs to accurately integrate scientific understanding of ecosystem dynamics and disturbances.
George Smith	1	Identify high risk slope areas in coast range, assess permissible disturbances, and match with modern harvesting technology: Several of the suggestions we have received have dealt with various aspects of this issue. Accordingly, the Board has directed the ODF staff to investigate this issue further, and then report back to us on possible courses of action.
Helen Franklin	2	Assert jurisdictional authority to reforest the Biscuit fire: The Governor has directed the Board to play an active, lead role on federal land management policy for the State of Oregon. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 legislature, and the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of our Forest Vitality work plan, will address this issue.
Helen Franklin	2	Give thoughtful consideration to non-regulatory means of habitat protection: The use of non-regulatory means of achieving conservation aims is a fundamental principle of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . The concerns that you raise come under our Forest Regulation work plan, which addresses such issues as voluntary measures, the Oregon Plan, and efficient implementation of the Forest Practices Act. Your concerns may also be relevant in other forums, such as any future legislative consideration of the Forest Legacy Program.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Helen Franklin	3	Integrate wildfire risk management with forest management and HCP: These concerns are largely addressed by elements of the National Fire Plan and by Senate Bill 360, which brings communities together to address fire issues in the urban-rural interface.
Helen Franklin	3	Address wildlife damage on timber mortality: I understand the serious nature of wildlife damage in some areas. Although this is not an issue that the Board is currently addressing as a policy matter, forest landowners are encouraged to consult with our stewardship foresters on solutions that can be implemented with available resources.
Helen Franklin	4	Pursue Title III funding to target urban areas: As these federal funds are controlled by counties, our issue scan work group felt that this is primarily a county issue. We do encourage counties to invest in forest education and community forestry, and we work with them when they do so.
Jack Drinkwater	2	Manage forests as a crop/renewable resource: Many of the issues you raise involve federal forestlands. As you may know, the Governor has directed the Board to play a more prominent role on behalf of Oregonians in the planning of federal forest management activities. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of our Forest Vitality work plan, and the work of the Forest Biomass work group under Objective 4 of that plan, will also address the issues you describe.
Jake Gibbs	1	Address invasive species: This is a serious and growing problem in our forests. The Board has requested additional ODF staff work on the issue, including suggesting possible roles for the Board. We expect to begin creating a new Board work plan on this topic during 2006.
Jake Gibbs	2	Federal forestland management is the Governor's issue, not the Board's: In an address to the Board in the fall of 2004, the Governor directed us to play a lead role on this topic for the State of Oregon. He emphasized the importance of these lands to Oregon's wellbeing, and expressed the belief that the Board and ODF have expertise that would be useful to the federal agencies. Accordingly, we are proceeding to carry out his direction through a variety of means, including implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, and the development of a vision for federal land management through our Forest Vitality work plan.
Jake Gibbs	2	Continue development of incentives and non-regulatory means: The use of incentives and non-regulatory means of achieving desired aims is a fundamental principle of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . It is also reflected in our work plans, in particular the Forest Regulation plan, and remains an area of emphasis for the Board.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Jason Miner	2	Review non-timber resources protected by land classifications: This issue is considered in the Board's State Forests work plan, Objective 1. Non-timber resources such as wildlife and water quality are addressed in forest management plans. ODF also is currently reviewing processes and policy regarding special forest products.
Jason Miner	2	Examine integrated landscape-scale forest management: Objective 2 of the Board's Dynamic Ecosystems work plan will synthesize existing analytical tools, monitoring data, and research information to begin quantifying short-term and long-term ecosystem risks from potential future forest management and policy choices. Additional work in this area will be accomplished through the ODF Forest Assessment Project.
Joel Nelson	2	Continue commitment to science-based decisions: This is a fundamental concept in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> , and something to which the Board is highly committed. This issue is addressed in Objectives 2 and 4 of the Board's Forest Regulation work plan. The Board's work with Oregon Administrative Rules 527.714 and OAR 527.765 also addresses this concern. The Board also held a workshop last September to evaluate the issue.
Joel Nelson	3	Continue focus on current work plans: Our current work plans are ambitious, broad in scope, and directly related to the visions and strategies of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . We will continue to move ahead on all of them in the coming year, and expect that a good share of the goals identified in the plans will occupy us during 2007 as well. Most of the input we have received during our issue scan process has pertained to the existing work plans – an indication, I believe, that we are addressing the key issues and priorities facing forestry in the state.
John & Lynne Breese	2	Save eastside watersheds: The need to address eastside issues was a common theme in the input we received, and stood out as a matter of concern to the work group and the Board. The Board plans to address these concerns through its Forest Vitality work plan, particularly Objectives 1, 2, and 4. The forest sector economic development policies to be developed through Objective 1 will be important in this regard. The work plan calls for creation of an Institutional Capacity Work Group and a Forest Industries Task Force to explore issues and solutions. Also important is the ongoing work of the Committee for Family Forestlands. Of course, the federal government is a major eastside forestland owner, and the Board is taking on a growing role in federal forest management issues. Progress in this area will come through implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, and through the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Forest Vitality work plan. The plan also calls for creation of a Forest Biomass Work Group to address some of the issues you raise.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
John & Lynne Breese	2	Develop a sustainable infrastructure to economically use small wood & juniper: The Board plans to address this issue through many of the same mechanisms described above, including the Forest Vitality work plan and the implementation of SB 1072.
John C. Belton	2	Market quality wood products: The forest sector economic development policies to be developed through Objective 1 of our Forest Vitality work plan will address this issue. This will be accomplished in part through the creation of an Institutional Capacity Work Group and the Forest Industries Task Force. This is an important issue bearing on the future of the forest sector, and we welcome your continued input as these efforts take shape.
John Griffith	2	<p>Increase public and private timber harvest to sustain Oregon's forests; increase state forest harvests: The forest sector economic development policies to be created through Objective 1 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan will address private-lands aspects of this issue. This will be accomplished through the creation of an Institutional Capacity Work Group, a Forest Industries Task Force, through discussions with family forestland owners, and with the ongoing work of the Committee for Family Forestlands.</p> <p>Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Forest Vitality work plan, and the work of the Forest Biomass work group under Objective 4 will also address parts of this issue.</p> <p>State forest harvests are addressed in the Board's State Forests Management work plan. The Board will be reviewing new information about state forests management in the spring, and determining whether any changes to the existing management plan are necessary. The actual timber harvest on state land is set by the state forester, based on the management plan, rather than by the Board.</p> <p>The State Forests Program has been implementing the forest management plan for five years. In the first two years of implementation, the program harvested below the mid-point of the harvest levels suggested in the Implementation Plans. The program harvested above the mid-point for the past three years.</p>
John Griffith	2	Federal forest management issue examination should include more local community involvement: As mentioned above, these issues will be addressed through means such as SB 1072 and the Forest Vitality work plan.
John Griffith	3	Support the Tillamook Forest Center: I appreciate your comments, and believe the center will be a very valuable outreach and education resource.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
John Rounds	2	Address federal land management in Eastern Oregon: The need to address eastside issues was a common theme in the input we received, and stood out as a matter of concern to the work group and the Board. Various elements throughout the Forest Vitality work plan will address these concerns. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the work plan, and the work of the Forest Biomass work group under Objective 4 will also address some of these concerns.
Kristina McNitt	2	Maintain family forestland ownership base, and address impediments and incentives for family forestland owners: The forest sector economic development policies to be developed through Objective 1 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan will address this issue. This will be accomplished through the creation of an Institutional Capacity Work Group, the Forest Industries Task Force, and ongoing work of the Committee for Family Forestlands.
Larry Dorland	3	Enhance forest-providing habitat for all species: Your comment seems to pertain to state forests. The Board's State Forests Management Plan addresses issues related to those lands, and in particular strives to attain greatest permanent value – a sustainable balance of economic, social, and environmental benefits. The Board will be receiving additional data about state forests in the spring and will make decisions about whether changes to the current management plans are necessary.
Lex Loeb	2	Clarify the difference between private and public holdings: Your comments seem to relate primarily to the need for this clarification, and for greater management flexibility on private lands. The Board has already addressed this issue in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . A key premise of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> is that different types of forestland should be managed with different emphases. Some lands are managed with a focus on timber production, subject to environmental protections. Other lands are managed to emphasize non-timber values, and still others, such as state forestlands, are managed to produce a broad range of benefits. This mosaic of management approaches is essential to our vision of forests that, over time and across the landscape, produce a sustainable flow of environmental, social, and economic benefits. The Board's work plans for State Forests, Forest Regulation, and Forest Vitality further clarify roles and expectations for private, state, and federal forestlands.
Lisa DeBruyckere	1	Examine forest certification for State Forests: The State Forests Program recently completed a pre-assessment for FSC certification of the Sun Pass State Forest. Upon reviewing the report from that pre-assessment, we will decide whether or not to pursue certification in June of 2006.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Lisa DeBruyckere	1	Update land acquisition/ exchange program: The State Forests Program lifted the moratorium on land exchanges in December of 2005, and is currently updating all policies and guidelines associated with land acquisition/land exchanges.
Lisa DeBruyckere	1	Reconcile the 10-year review of the Forest Management Plan (FMP): The 10-year review of the FMP is scheduled for 2011. In 2006, we are conducting a second-party assessment of the FMP to help us identify any gaps in monitoring or plan implementation in preparation for a third-party audit of the plan and a 10-year review in the future.
Lisa DeBruyckere	2	Develop performance benchmarks and standards for the State Forests Program: The State Forests Program is currently mid-way through developing performance measures for the program and will be completed with that process in April of 2006. Completing that process includes district staff involvement (November and December 2005), and county and stakeholder involvement (in December of 2005 and January of 2006). Adapting the forest management plans necessitates having performance measures and benchmarks for which the plan and our program can be evaluated. Failure to complete these encourages interests to focus on one or two aspects of managing state forestlands, versus achieving greatest permanent value goals that incorporate economic, environmental, and social values.
Lisa DeBruyckere	2	Elliott State Forest Management Plan & HCP: Because this item is in the existing work plan and the work is rolling over into 2006 with significant decision points in 2006, we believed we would roll it over into the 2006 BOF work plan as part of Objective 1.
Lisa DeBruyckere	2	Examine roadless areas on federal lands: Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, and the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Forest Vitality work plan, will address this issue.
Liz VanLeeuwen	2	<p>Clarify "sustainable forestry;" support timber harvest in a productive and economical manner: Sustainable forest management is already defined by the board in its 2003 <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i>. Under the definition, sustainable forest management means that "forest resources across the landscape are used, developed and protected at a rate and in a manner that enables people to meet their current environmental, economic, and social needs, and also provides that future generations can meet their own needs." This is consistent with the definition of "sustainability" provided in law (ORS 182.421).</p> <p>Indicators to help us gauge our progress in achieving sustainable forest management will be developed in 2006 through Objective 2 of the Board's <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> work plan.</p>

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Lynch & Yvonne Jones	3	<p>Opposes "Green" crowd policies: Unfortunately, many forest management issues have become associated in recent years with ongoing conflict. Often, this conflict seems to arise from beliefs that the various kinds of benefits that forests provide – economic, social, and environmental – are in competition with each other. My own belief, and a basic premise of our <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> policy document, is that these values are in fact inter-dependent – we can't successfully and sustainably achieve one without the others.</p> <p>Our Board is committed to operating in an inclusive, transparent fashion. By definition, participation in our work is open to all who are interested. I believe we receive input from people with a broad variety of beliefs and concerns. My hope is that the concepts of sustainability, and the notion that environmental, economic, and social benefits of forests are linked, will help to ease the conflict that we have seen on forestry issues.</p>
Mark Rasmussen	2	<p>Provide leadership regarding USFS wilderness in Oregon: Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, and the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan, will address this and other federal land issues.</p>
Mike Gaudern	2	<p>Improve the Periodic Issues Scan Process: There has been discussion among the Board, the issue scan work group, and ODF staff about how the process may be carried out in the future. The Board has not yet come to decisions about the nature or timing of the next scan, but we have noted your comments, and those of others, about the challenge of staying current on many issues and on the need for adequate time to respond.</p> <p>As you know, ODF has retained a consultant to set up systems to assist our evolving decision process, including a means of organizing the many documents associated with that process. Your input is valuable as we continue to find ways to keep our process transparent and accessible to the public and our stakeholders.</p>
Mike Gaudern	2	<p>Stimulate action on federal lands and in eastern Oregon: The forest sector economic development policies to be developed through Objective 1 of our Forest Vitality work plan will address this issue. This will be accomplished through the creation of an Institutional Capacity Work Group, the Forest Industries Task Force, and ongoing work of the Committee for Family Forestlands. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072 (passed by the 2005 Legislature), the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the work plan, and the work of the Forest Biomass work group under Objective 4 will also address this issue.</p>

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Mike Gaudern	3	“Ground truthing” of issue scan comments: The staff and the issue scan work group devoted considerable time to analyzing the input before forwarding it to the Board. We are confident that we received a diversity of comments from a broad array of groups and individuals engaged in the full range of ODF activities.
Mike Gaudern	3	Stabilize budgets for field stewardship positions: This is a major concern, and reflects the broader financial pressure that faces state government today. The department is beginning to consider legislative concepts for the 2007 session, and this issue is on the list. The department welcomes the opportunity to work with you in explaining to legislators how important ODF’s services are to landowners and to the cause of maintaining healthy, sustainable forests.
Miles Hemstrom	2	Develop common language to discuss forest policies and effects: The use in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> of an internationally recognized language and framework for assessing forest sustainability seeks to address the concern you raise. The department’s Forest Assessment Project also responds to this issue.
Miles Hemstrom	2	Develop common policy and planning models to achieve further cohesive approaches with USFS, BLM, and others: The Governor has directed the Board to play an active, lead role on federal land management policy for the State of Oregon. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, and the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Board’s Forest Vitality work plan, will address this issue. In addition, the state recently signed a memorandum of understanding with the BLM regarding state participation in planning the future management of the Oregon and California lands, and we look forward to maintaining and enhancing our planning-level partnerships with the Forest Service as well.
Nancy Nichols	1	Reassess harvest notifications to homeowners in high-risk landslide zones: Your suggestion would require changes to Oregon Administrative Rules. Based on input received on this issue, the Board has directed the ODF staff to investigate the issue further, and then report back to us on possible courses of action.
Nancy Nichols	1	Reevaluate violation fines: We have directed further staff investigation of this matter. Changing the fines would require amendments to the administrative rules that implement the Oregon Forest Practices Act.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Pat Grimstad	3	<p>Need sound productive, sustainable timber harvesting: Sustainable harvest of timber - and sustainable production of other forest benefits – are at the heart of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i>. This document describes sustainable forest management as using, developing, and protecting forest resources "at a rate and in a manner that enables people to meet their current environmental, economic, and social needs, and also provides that future generations can meet their own needs."</p> <p>The <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i>, in turn, provides the basis for the priority work of the Board and ODF. The document is available from the department, or at the web address mentioned in this letter.</p> <p>As you point out, we need people with many viewpoints and experiences to help us achieve healthy, sustainable forests.</p>
Paul Bell	1	<p>Consider possible rule changes to reduce public risk from shallow, rapid landslides: Based on input received on this issue, the Board has directed the ODF staff to investigate the issue further, and then report back to us on possible courses of action.</p>
Paul Bell	1	<p>Develop comprehensive invasive species strategy that considers federal policies and improves state-to-state consistency: Invasive and noxious species are a serious and growing problem in our forests. The Board has requested additional ODF staff work on the issue, including suggesting possible roles for the Board. We expect to begin creating a new Board work plan on this topic during 2006.</p> <p>A significant amount of the problem with invasive species and fire risk occurs on federal land, and at the Governor's direction, the Board is working to develop a lead role on behalf of the state on federal forest planning issues. This task is addressed in Objective 2 of our Forest Vitality work plan.</p>
Paul Bell	2	<p>05-3 Forest Vitality Objective 2. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature and the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 will address federal land management policies, but maybe not to this level of detail.</p>

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Paul Bell	2	Address structure and other issues related to Forest Resource Trust: The Board recognizes the importance of the trust, and has begun taking steps, including lowering the interest rate for borrowers, to improve the program. This work is being done through Objective 3 of the Board's Forest Regulation work plan.
Paul Bell	3	Request funds for sudden oak death surveying, monitoring and eradication: As part of the preparation for the 2007 legislative session, the Oregon Department of Forestry staff is considering options for seeking needed funds.
Paul Dunn	2	Increase collaboration on analysis of the base data on biomass and sustainable economic development issues, and indicators of risk: The Board's <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> Implementation work plan, Objective 2, addresses this issue, in particular through its advisory committee on developing sustainable forest management indicators. ODF's ongoing forest assessment work also plays a key role.
Paul Dunn	2	Expand outreach to urban populations to improve understanding of shifting public values for forestland: The Board acknowledges the importance of this issue, and has developed a work plan devoted to urban outreach. The communication strategies that will be addressed through this plan will be based on available polling and focus group data, including that gathered by the Oregon Forest Resources Institute in the fall of 2005, and by ODF in work that is scheduled for spring of 2006. In addition, the department continually seeks input from people in urban and interface areas through such activities as community fire planning and our partnerships with a variety of cities and urban forestry groups.
Paul Dunn	2	Increase knowledge, scientific collaboration on disturbances: The concerns you raise are addressed in several objectives of the Board's Dynamic Ecosystems work plan. Objectives 1 and 2 will result in a public symposium on dynamic ecosystems and will synthesize existing analytical tools, monitoring data, and research information to begin quantifying short-term and long-term ecosystem risks from potential future forest management and policy choices. Objective 4 will potentially modify policies and programs to accurately integrate scientific understanding of ecosystem dynamics.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
PCAM	1	<p>Experiment with grazing for noxious weed removal and wildfire risk reduction: Grazing has been used in a number of locations as a wildfire risk reduction technique. In addition, the Board has a full work plan dedicated to wildfire issues.</p> <p>Invasive and noxious species are a serious and growing problem in our forests. The Board has requested additional ODF staff work on the issue, including suggesting possible roles for the Board. We expect to begin creating a new Board work plan on this topic during 2006.</p> <p>A significant amount of the problem with invasive species and fire risk occurs on federal land, and at the Governor's direction, the Board is working to develop a lead role on behalf of the state on federal forest planning issues. This task is addressed in Objective 2 of our Forest Vitality work plan.</p>
PCAM	4	<p>Issue permits for hemp plantations as an experiment in fiber production: In our analysis of the many suggestions we received during our issue scan, we determined that a few were outside of the Board's purview, which involves overseeing Oregon's forestlands. This particular issue appeared to us to be more involved with the state's agricultural operations, and perhaps could be addressed to an entity involved in regulation of agriculture.</p>
Peter Sikora	2	<p>Provide input to federal agencies to support active fuels management, aggressive fire suppression, and cooperative access: We are working to implement the Governor's direction that the Board and ODF become leaders in representing Oregon in federal forest management planning processes.</p> <p>Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature; the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan; and the work of the Forest Biomass work group under Objective 4 of that plan, will address the issues you raise.</p>
Peter Sikora	2	<p>Support/develop policies and regulations to ensure continued private forestry investments; address protection of working forests from encroachment of non-forest uses: The forest sector economic development policies to be developed through Objective 1 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan will address the forestry investment issue. This will be accomplished through the creation of an Institutional Capacity Work Group, a Forest Industries Task Force, and ongoing work of the Committee for Family Forestlands. Objective 3 of the work plan will result in policies and possibly legislation focused on retaining working forests.</p>

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Peter Sikora	2	Support OFRI through coordination with, and involvement of, Board of Forestry and ODF: The Board and ODF are committed partners of OFRI, and cooperate in a variety of communication, research, and other activities. Objective 4 of the Board's Urban Outreach work plan specifically mentions OFRI as a cooperating organization.
Peter Sikora	2	Encourage ODF to continue communications with other agencies and the public regarding forestry and forest ecosystem dynamics: Objectives 4 and 5 of the Urban Outreach work plan deal specifically with increasing public understanding of forestry and forest ecosystems. The Tillamook Forest Center, scheduled to open in the spring of 2006, will also be an important outreach and communication resource.
Peter Sikora	2	Facilitate efforts to have Oregon forest practices rules recognized as meeting requirements for federal ESA and CWA: The Board's Forest Regulation work plan addresses these issues. In particular, our work dealing with ORS 527.714 and 527.765 addresses CWA requirements and the development of state rules. Objective 4 of the work plan will address special resource sites.
Peter Sikora	2	Use well supported and verified science/research to formulate policy and regulation: This is a current strategy of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . The Board's work with Oregon Administrative Rules 527.714 and OAR 527.765 addresses this concern, as do Objectives 2 and 4 of our Forest Regulation work plan. The Board also held a workshop in September 2005 to evaluate this issue.
Peter Sikora	3	Foster continued spirit of cooperation and coordination with forest landowners: This is a current and longstanding approach of both the Board and the department. We recognize the importance of cooperation, voluntary action, and incentives in achieving sustainable forestry goals that benefit the state as a whole.
Peter Sikora	3	Support ODF personnel succession planning, professional development, and training: Like many organizations inside and outside government, ODF is working to address the needs that will result from the relatively large number of retirements expected in the coming years. The department has a variety of recruiting, leadership, and professional development programs, and encourages participation in outside training and development opportunities as budget resources allow.
Rex Storm	1	Address invasive species management: This is a serious and growing problem in our forests. The Board has requested additional ODF staff work on the issue, including suggesting possible roles for the Board. We expect to begin creating a new Board work plan on this topic during 2006.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Rex Storm	3	Improve industrial fire data collection: ODF collects a great deal of fire cause data – more than most federal and state wildfire agencies. Although your specific suggestion is not addressed in the Board's Wildfire Risk Management work plan, the entire FIRES database program is currently being reviewed for update and improvement. This issue may be resolved as a part of that effort.
Richard Re	1	Pursue certification in context of Oregon's Forest Practices Act: The Board recognizes certification as an important issue, and expects to develop a work plan to address its various facets. Currently, ODF is engaged in several studies on certification, including one examining the relationship of various certification systems to the requirements of Oregon's Forest Practices Act. Results of these studies will help form the basis of our work plan. Because of this, combined with other workload items, I expect that the Board's work in this area will begin in earnest in 2007.
Richard Re	2	Seek sustainable harvest approach on state lands: This item is included in Objective 1 of the Board's current State Forests Management work plan. The evaluation of harvest levels on the state forests of Northwest Oregon is part of the department's Harvest and Habitat modeling effort, which is scheduled to conclude in the spring of 2006. Based on the modeling data and other information, the Board will determine whether any changes are necessary to the current forest management plan.
Richard Re	2	Continue science-based approach to regulation: This is a current strategy in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> , one that the Board is developing further through its Forest Regulation work plan. The Board's work with Oregon Administrative Rules 527.714 and OAR 527.765 addresses this issue. The Board also held a workshop in September 2005 to evaluate the issue.
Richard Re	3	Share costs of wildfire management with private landowners and the general public: This issue was thoroughly debated in the 2005 state legislature, which ultimately passed HB 2327. The bill establishes a cost-sharing system that I believe has the potential to maintain Oregon's successful wildland firefighting system well into the future.
Rob Crouch	2	Devote resources to address urban forestry issues and elevate the importance of urban forestry with policymakers: I appreciate your supportive and thoughtful comments about urban forestry. Benefits such as air and water quality, wildlife habitat, and favorable economic and social trends are well recognized and will be part of the content of the outreach done to increase understanding of the value of urban forestry. We look forward to your continued input and support as the Board and ODF staff continue to pursue our work plan in this area.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Ron Ring	2	Strengthen restrictions on streams and seasonal streams used for salmon spawning: Many of the ideas you suggest are currently in the Forest Practices Act and are addressed in written plans. Additional stream protection requirements are currently under consideration through the Board's Forest Regulation work plan. Specific aspects of the work plan address riparian management areas.
Russ McKinley	2	Review State Forest Management to understand why it's different than private lands: To achieve greatest permanent value on state forestlands, which constitute three percent of Oregon's forestland base, it was agreed through a broad-based, 7-year process that we would consider economic, environmental, and social values in managing these forests. Most private lands are not managed by statute or goal to achieve greatest permanent value. However, we do believe a continual review of how we manage these lands using the latest science and information (i.e., adaptive management) is included in Objective 1 of the Board's State Forests Management work plan.
Russ McKinley	2	Develop a unified point of view to federal land managers: The Governor has directed the Board to play an active, lead role on federal land management policy for the State of Oregon. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, and the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under Objective 2 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan, will address this issue.
Russ McKinley	3	Incorporate Dynamic Ecosystems in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i>: Our Dynamic Ecosystems work plan reflects growing interest and understanding about the changes in ecosystems, and the role of disturbance. While the current FPFO includes among its value statements an acknowledgment of the dynamic nature of forests, this concept may merit closer attention in the next revision of the document.
Russ McKinley	3	Integrate with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Comprehensive Wildlife Program; provide a clear picture about Oregon forestlands and wildlife: This integrated approach is important, and is consistent with the values of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . Although the specific issue you raise is not directly addressed in our work plans, we strive for ongoing coordination with the Governor's Office and the Fish and Wildlife Commission to achieve statewide plant and animal conservation assessments and policies that address all land uses.
Sandra Deaton	1	Control problem plants: Invasive species are a serious and growing problem in our forests. The Board has requested additional ODF staff work on the issue, including suggesting possible roles for the Board. We expect to begin creating a new Board work plan on this topic during 2006.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Sandra Deaton	3	Retain old growth trees; allow appropriate use of large firefighting equipment: These and many other topics are addressed in the 2003 <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> , a document available in printed form from the department or on the department's website. For instance, the document speaks to the importance of retaining a diversity of forest types, including older, structurally complex forest stands. It also addresses the role of fire in the ecosystem, and the importance of managing fire in ways that support landowner objectives.
Scott Leavengood	2	Provide economic incentives to private landowners for management for biological diversity and to invest in forest health: Such incentives are an important part of our regulatory approach. Objective 1 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan addresses this topic. Work on the issue will be accomplished through such means as creation of a Forest Industries Task Force, and the ongoing work of the Committee for Family Forestlands, an advisory body to the Board.
Stan Gregory	2	Future effects of forest practices, human and natural changes; future effects of forest practices as part of the Oregon Plan. The Board's Dynamic Ecosystems work plan begins to address some of these concerns. For example, Objective 2 of the work plan will synthesize existing analytical tools, monitoring data, and research information to begin quantifying short-term and long-term ecosystem risks from potential future forest management and policy choices. Objective 4 will potentially modify policies and programs to integrate scientific understanding of ecosystem dynamics.
Stan Gregory	2	Evaluate the effects of current forest practices on forest and aquatic ecosystems: These issues will be addressed through the Dynamic Ecosystems work plan. Objective 2 of the plan will synthesize existing analytical tools, monitoring data, and research information to begin quantifying short-term and long-term ecosystem risks from future forest management and policy choices. Additional work in this area will be accomplished through the Forest Regulation work plan.
Stan Gregory	4	Forest practices on non-forestry lands. Through our review, it was determined that because this is an issue that applies to agricultural lands rather than forestlands, it is beyond the Board's purview.
Steve Grasty	2	Assist the USFS to reach state goals: The Governor has directed the Board to play an active, lead role on federal land management policy for the State of Oregon. Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, and the federal land management vision and guidance work to be done under the Board's Forest Vitality work plan, will address this issue.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
The Nature Conservancy	1	Oak savanna/woodland restoration: This is an important and growing concern, one that, as you note in your letter, is capturing the attention of growing numbers of organizations and landowners. The Board has directed the ODF staff to investigate the issue further and return with options for addressing it, initially through the Board's Forest Regulation work plan. We invite your input as the process continues.
The Nature Conservancy	2	Maintain the forest land base using Forest Legacy and other tools: The issue is addressed in the Board's Forest Vitality work plan, particularly Objectives 3 and 5. Objective 3 will result in policies and possibly legislation focused on retaining working forests. Forest Legacy will be included in this process. Under Objective 5, the Forest Resource Trust Advisory Committee will develop recommendations to increase the number of forest acres eligible for carbon offset payments.
The Nature Conservancy	2	Restore forest resiliency: The Board is keenly aware of the increased fire vulnerability of many of our forests. With input from The Nature Conservancy and others, we expect to address the issue through our Forest Vitality work plan, Objective 4, and our wildfire risk reduction work plan. Work in other areas, such as implementation of SB 1072, passed by the 2005 Legislature, will also help to address this problem.
The Nature Conservancy	2	Work with partners to improve spatial land management: Objective 2 of the Board's Dynamic Ecosystems work plan will synthesize existing analytical tools, monitoring data, and research information to begin quantifying short-term and long-term ecosystem risks from potential future forest management and policy choices. Additional work in this area will be accomplished through the ODF Forest Assessment Project.
Tom Steinberg	1	Automatically notify homeowners at the base of high-risk hillsides and draws of logging plans: Based on input received on this issue, the Board has directed the ODF staff to investigate the issue further, and then report back to us on possible courses of action.
Walt Gentis	2	Concern about new smoke management requirements related to slash in eastern Oregon: The input you provided has been reviewed by staff in the department who are involved with this issue. In addition, there will be several opportunities for public comment as the process continues to unfold. The Board's Wildfire Risk Management work plan identifies a schedule of activities, including public hearings and Board of Forestry and Environmental Quality Commission actions, on revisions to the Smoke Management Plan (SMP), in early 2006. Development of possible legislation regarding changes to the plan will begin this year, and implementation of the revised plan is expected in early 2007.

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
Wayne Naillon	2	<p>Increase non-motorized trail construction; provide for backcountry, sanctuary experiences: I appreciate your comments about the need for diversity in recreation opportunities available in the state forests. Recreation plans for each state forest district are reviewed consistently by ODF staff, and seek to address the full continuum of recreation opportunities and facilities.</p> <p>As a Board, we acknowledge our responsibility to manage state forests to provide a broad range of social, economic, and ecological needs. Non-motorized trail construction and maintenance activities are reported as part of our annual review of state forests operations.</p>
Wild Salmon Center and others	2	<p>Analysis of full range of employment impacts for the forest products sector: The forest sector economic development policies to be developed through Objective 1 of the Board's Forest Vitality work plan will address this issue. Although we regard the Hovee economic research as valid and thorough, the work plan also calls for input from many other sources in an effort to complete the fullest possible picture.</p> <p>In addition, this issue will be partially addressed through Objective 2 of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> Implementation work plan. This objective calls for development, with broad-based input, of a variety of indicators and supporting assessment work to gauge our progress on the various strategies contained in the FPFO.</p>
Wild Salmon Center and others	1	<p>Independent peer review by wildlife biologists and aquatic scientists of the Harvest & Habitat model: This issue is part of Objective 1 of the State Forest Management work plan, which addresses whether new information should be used to make changes in forest management. ODF staff have been discussing whether or not to pursue a peer review of H & H since project inception in the spring of 2003. For a number of reasons, staff decided to defer further consideration of such a review until the final report of the project is presented to the Board.</p> <p>A fuller response about H & H peer review is available on the ODF website at http://oregon.gov/ODF/STATE_FORESTS/docs/2006issuesscanresponse.pdf</p> <p>Here is a summary of the considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions include what elements of the project would be peer-reviewed (overall process, input data, take avoidance assumptions, etc.), and who would conduct the review. It will take a thoughtful, inclusive process to clearly answer these and other questions. • The project is not developing any new law, policy, direction, or guidance. The model simulates current plans, direction, and principles, all of which have undergone significant

**Oregon Department of Forestry
Board Issue Scan – Follow-Up Matrix
Sorted by Submitters' First Name**

Submitter	Category	Board response (transmitted by letter from Board chair Steve Hobbs)
		<p>review, internally and externally. Assumptions regarding T&E species populations, to model Take Avoidance strategies (Alternative 2), were developed by a group of county commissioners, a consultant hired by the counties, ODF staff, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and ODFW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since its beginning, the project has included broad involvement. Updates have been provided to boards, committees and stakeholder groups. A Policy Team is in place with members from outside ODF, including legislators and representatives from Legislative Fiscal Office, DAS Budget and Management, and the Department of State Lands. • The state-of-the-art model was created by Dr. John Sessions, a spatial forest modeler and professor in the OSU College of Forestry. <p>For these reasons, ODF staff concluded that a peer review is not desirable at this time. This decision will be reconsidered at the Board level, after we receive the H & H report, and after stakeholder discussion.</p>
Wild Salmon Center and others	2	<p>Create permanent reserves on state forestlands to protect Oregon's natural heritage: This issue is addressed in Objective 1 of the Board's State Forests Management work plan. ODF's State Forests Program is exploring, through the four alternatives of the Harvest & Habitat Model project, possible options for providing a variety of volume and structure targets across the landscape on state forests, which comprise about three percent of Oregon's forestlands.</p> <p>Alternative 4 is reserve-based, and we're actively working with stakeholders to determine the possible size and location of these reserves, as well as appropriate and acceptable levels of management activity within the reserves. We believe the results of this model alternative, in combination with the other three alternatives, will generate a rich discussion of the role and potential of reserves on state lands. In 2006, the Board will have an opportunity to engage stakeholders in a discussion about this issue as part of its existing work plan on adapting the forest management plan.</p>
Wild Salmon Center and others	2	<p>Retain conservation management on Elliott State Forest: This item is included in Objective 1 of the State Forests Management work plan, which assumes continued management of the Elliott by ODF. Because ODF manages common school lands on behalf of the State Land Board, which owns them, decision-making about revisions to the existing Forest Management Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan are shared by the Forestry and Land Boards. These revisions have been developed by an interdisciplinary team that included wildlife biologists, with a goal of balancing ecological and economic goals.</p>